

REMARKS

A Final Rejection for the above-identified application was mailed on August 12, 2003. Accordingly, a petition and the fee for a two-month extension of time in which to file a response are being filed contemporaneously with this amendment and response under Rule 116.

Applicants thank the Examiner and his Supervisor for the telephone interview they graciously granted on December 16, 2003. As a result of the interview, claims 1-8 were allowed in an Advisory Action mailed December 19, 2003 but the rejection of claims 9-22 was maintained. During the telephone interview, the Examiner and his SPE indicated that claims 9-22 would also be allowed if they were amended to claim that the claimed overlay generators were capable of driving each of first and second displays.

In light of the agreement reached during the telephone interview, the Applicants submit that the foregoing amendment should be entered under Rule 116 (and an RCE avoided) because the respective positions of the Examiner and the Applicants were not fully understood by each other until after the December 16, 2003 telephone interview. Accordingly, entry of the foregoing amendment and allowance of claims 1-22 thereafter is respectfully requested.

In particular, the Examiner allowed claims 1-8 because the prior art does not show first and second video overlay generators that are *each* capable of being coupled to corresponding first and second display devices. The Examiner maintained the final rejection of claims 9-22 because those claims do not expressly require the outputs of the video overlay generators to be capable of being coupled to each of two display devices.

The Applicants appreciate the allowance of claims 1-8 but for the prosecution record, the Applicants maintain that a multiplexor cannot be construed to be an overlay generator. Nevertheless, in order to expedite issuance of the Applicants' patent, the Applicants have amended claims 9-22 as set forth above and submit that upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 9-22 should be allowed as they will expressly recite that the claimed overlay generators are each capable of sending video to multiple display devices.

Claims 1-8

Notwithstanding the allowance of claim 1, it too has been amended to clarify the scope of the subject matter that the Applicants are entitled to claim. In particular, the claim has been amended to claim that the overlay generators are each capable of driving *at least* first and second displays. In other words, the overlay generators can drive multiple displays.

The foregoing amendment to claim 1 was discussed with the Examiner on December 16th and agreement was reached during the telephone interview that such an amendment to claim 1 would not render the claim unpatentable. Support for the amendment to claim 1 is found in Figure 2 and on page 8, lines 20-24, which teach that the overlay generator is coupled to a CRT, a television and an LCD display.

As for claim 2, the Applicants retract arguments for its allowance that were made in the previous response.


Claims 9-22

Paraphrased, independent claims 9 and 15 now claim that the first and second overlay generators are each capable of driving multiple displays. In particular, the claims have been reworded to expressly recite that the overlay generators are each capable of being coupled to multiple display devices. Support for the newly added limitation is found in Figure 2 and on page 8, lines 20-24, both of which teach that the overlay generators are coupled to a CRT, a television and an LCD display.

As stated above, during the December 16th telephone interview, the Examiner indicated that claims 9 and 15 would be allowable if they were amended to expressly recite that the overlay generators are each capable of driving multiple display devices. As a matter of law, claims that depend on claims 9 and 15 are therefore allowable as well. Nevertheless, previously made arguments for the allowance of claims 10-14 and 16-22 are incorporated herein by reference.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicants request entry of the foregoing amendment under Rule 116 and allowance of claims 1-22 thereafter.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Joseph P. Krause
Registration No. 32,578

Date: January 7, 2004

VEDDER, PRICE, KAUFMAN &
KAMMHOLZ, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60601
PHONE: (312) 609-7536
FAX: (312) 609-5005
MAIL: jkrause@vedderprice.com